arXiv:1609.02833v2 [math.NT] 12 Sep 2016

ON THE GENERALIZED RESTRICTED SUMSETS IN ABELIAN GROUPS

SHANSHAN DU AND HAO PAN

Abstract. Suppose that A, B and S are non-empty subsets of a finite abelian group G. Then the generalized restricted sumset

$$A \overset{S}{+} B := \{a+b:\ a\in A,\ b\in B,\ a-b\notin S\}$$

contains at least

$$\min\{|A|+|B|-3|S|, p(G)\}$$

elements, where $p(G)$ is the least prime factor of $|G|$. Further, we also have

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq \min\{|A|+|B|-|S|-2, p(G)\},$$

provided that both $|A|$ and $|B|$ are large with respect to $|S|$.

1. Introduction

Suppose that G is a finite abelian group and A, B are two non-empty subsets of G. Define the sumset

$$A+B := \{a+b:\ a\in A,\ b\in B\}.$$

For a positive integer n, let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ denote the cyclic group of order n. If p is prime and $\emptyset \neq A, B \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_p$, then classical Cauchy-Davenport theorem (cf. [12, Theorem 2.2]) says that

$$|A+B| \geq \min\{|A|+|B|-1, p\}. \tag{1.1}$$

For a finite abelian group G, let $p(G)$ denote the least prime factor of $|G|$. In view of the well-known Kneser theorem, we have the following extension of the Cauchy-Davenport theorem in abelian groups:

$$|A+B| \geq \min\{|A|+|B|-1, p(G)\}, \tag{1.2}$$

where A, B are two non-empty subsets of G.

On the other hand, Erdős and Heilbronn [7, 8] considered the restricted sumset

$$A \dot{+} B := \{a+b:\ a\in A,\ b\in B,\ a\neq b\}.$$

They conjectured that if p is prime and A, B are two non-empty subsets $\mathbb{Z}_p$, then

$$|A \dot{+} A| \geq \min\{2|A|-3, p\}. \tag{1.3}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11P70; Secondary 11B13.

Key words and phrases. Restricted sumsets.

With help of the exterior algebra, Dias da Silva and Hamidoune [5] confirmed the conjecture of Erdős and Heilbronn. Subsequently, using the polynomial method, Alon, Nathanson and Ruzsa [2, 3] gave a simple proof of the Erdős-Heilbronn conjecture. In fact, they obtained that

$$|A \dot{+} B| \geq \min\{|A| + |B| - 2, p\}, \tag{1.4}$$

provided $|A| \neq |B|$.

In [9, 10], Károlyi considered the Erdős-Heilbronn problem in abelian groups. He proved that

$$|A \dot{+} A| \geq \min\{2|A| - 3, p(G)\}, \tag{1.5}$$

where A is a non-empty subset of a finite abelian group G. In [4], Balister and Wheeler showed that for $\emptyset \neq A, B \subseteq G$,

$$|A \dot{+} B| \geq \min\{|A| + |B| - 3, p(G)\}. \tag{1.6}$$

They even proved that (1.6) is still valid when G is a finite group (not necessarily commutative). The key ingredient of the proofs of Károlyi and Balister-Wheeler is an inductive step, i.e., to prove (1.5) and (1.6) under the hypothesis that they are valid for H and G/H, where H is a subgroup of G.

In this paper, we shall consider the generalized restricted sumset

$$A \overset{S}{+} B := \{a + b : \ a \in A, \ b \in B, \ a - b \notin S\},$$

where A, B, S are the non-empty subsets of G. When $G = \mathbb{Z}_p$ with p is prime, Pan and Sun proved that

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq \min\{|A| + |B| - |S| - 2, p\}, \tag{1.7}$$

provided that $|S| < p$. Notice that the restriction $|S| < p$ is necessary, since if $S = \mathbb{Z}_p$, then $A \overset{S}{+} B$ is always empty.

It is natural to find a generalization of (1.7) for abelian groups. However, as we shall see later, the inductive step will become much more complicated when $|S|$ is large. Here we can establish the following weak type extension of (1.7) for abelian groups.

Theorem 1.1. *Let G be a finite abelian group. Suppose that A, B and S are non-empty subsets of G. Then*

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq \min\{|A| + |B| - 3|S|, p(G)\}. \tag{1.8}$$

In fact, essentially our proof of Theorem 1.1 doesn't depend on the fact that G is abelian. In Section 2, we shall also give a brief explanation how to extend (1.8) to general finite groups.

Although Theorem 1.1 holds unconditionally, we can get the better lower bound of $|A \overset{S}{+} B|$ under some additional assumptions. For example, when $G = \mathbb{Z}_{p^\alpha}$, (1.8) can be improved to [14, Remark 1.3]

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq \min\{|A| + |B| - 2|S| - 1, p\}. \tag{1.9}$$

On the other hand, if $|A|, |B|$ are large with respect to $|S|$, we can show that (1.7) is also valid for any finite abelian groups.

Theorem 1.2. *Let A, B and S be non-empty subsets of an abelian group G. Suppose that*

$$\min\{|A|, |B|\} \geq 9|S|^2 - 5|S| - 3.$$

Then

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq \min\{|A| + |B| - |S| - 2, p(G)\}. \tag{1.10}$$

2. Proof of Theorem 1.1

Lemma 2.1. *Let $p \geq 3$ be a prime and $\alpha \geq 1$. Suppose that A, B, S are non-empty subsets of $\mathbb{F}_{p^\alpha}$ with $|S| < p$, where $\mathbb{F}_{p^\alpha}$ is the finite field with p^α elements. Then for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{F}_{p^\alpha} \setminus \{0, -1\}$, the cardinality of the restricted sumset*

$$\{a + b : \ a \in A, \ b \in B, \ a - \gamma b \notin S\}$$

is at least

$$\min\{|A| + |B| - |S| - 2, p\}.$$

Proof. This is [13, Corollary 2]. □

Lemma 2.2. *Let p be a prime and $\alpha \geq 1$. Suppose that $A = \{a_1, \ldots, a_m\}$, $B = \{b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$ and S are non-empty subsets of $\mathbb{F}_{p^\alpha}$ with $|S| < p$. Let $h = |S|$ and suppose that $m \geq h + 3$. If $m + n - h - 2 \leq p$,then the set*

$$(A \overset{S}{+} B) \setminus \{a_1 + b_1, \ldots, a_1 + b_n\}$$

contains the distinct elements

$$a_{i_1} + b_{j_1}, a_{i_2} + b_{j_2}, \ldots, a_{i_{m-h-2}} + b_{j_{m-h-2}}$$

such that for each $1 \leq k \leq m - h - 2$

$$i_k \in \{2, 3, \ldots, h + 2, k + h + 2\}.$$

Proof. Let

$$X_k = (\{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{h+2}, a_{k+h+2}\} \overset{S}{+} B) \setminus \{a_1 + b_1, \ldots, a_1 + b_n\}$$

for each $1 \le k \le m-h-2$. Clearly for any $\emptyset \ne k \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, m-h-2\}$, using Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\bigcup_{k\in I} X_k =& \bigg(\Big(\{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{h+2}\} \cup \bigcup_{k\in I}\{a_{k+h+2}\}\Big) \overset{S}{+} B\bigg) \setminus \{a_1+b_1, \ldots, a_1+b_n\}\\ \le& \big(h+2+|I|\big)+|B|-|S|-2\big)-n = |I|.\end{aligned}$$

With help of the well-known Hall theorem, we may choose distinct $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{m-h-2}$ such that $x_k \in X_k$ for each $k = 1, \ldots, m-h-2$, i.e., $x_k = a_{i_k} + b_{j_k}$ with $i_k \in \{2, \ldots, h+2, k+h+2\}$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Assume that our assertion is true for any proper subgroup of G. Suppose that $|A|+|B|-3|S| > p(G)$. Then we may choose non-empty $A' \subseteq A$ and $B' \subseteq B$ such that $|A'|+|B'|-3|S| = p(G)$. Clearly $|A \overset{S}{+} B| \ge |A' \overset{S}{+} B'|$. So we may assume that $|A|+|B|-3|S| \le p(G)$. On the other hand, trivially we have

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \ge \max\{|A|-|S|,\ |B|-|S|\}.$$

So $|A|+|B|-3|S| > |B|-|S|$ will imply $|A| > 2|S|$, i.e.,

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \ge |A|-|S| \ge |S|+1.$$

Hence we always assume that $|S| < p(G)$.

Let H be a proper subgroup of G such that $[G:H] = p(G)$. Write

$$A = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m}(a_i + \mathcal{A}_i), \qquad B = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n}(b_i + \mathcal{B}_i), \qquad S = \bigcup_{i=1}^{h}(s_i + \mathcal{S}_i),$$

where $\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{B}_i, \mathcal{S}_i$ are non-empty subsets of H and $a_i - a_j, b_i - b_j, s_i - s_j \notin H$ for any distinct i, j. Noting that

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| = |(-B) \overset{(-S)}{+} (-A)|,$$

without loss of generality, we may assume that $n \ge m$. Furthermore, assume that

$$|\mathcal{A}_1| \ge |\mathcal{A}_2| \ge \cdots \ge |\mathcal{A}_m|.$$

For each $a \in G$, let $\bar{a}$ denote the coset $a + H$. Let

$$\bar{A} = \{\bar{a}_1, \ldots, \bar{a}_m\}, \qquad \bar{B} = \{\bar{b}_1, \ldots, \bar{b}_n\}, \qquad \bar{S} = \{\bar{s}_1, \ldots, \bar{s}_h\}.$$

In view of Lemma 3.1,

$$|\bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}| \ge |\bar{A}| + |\bar{B}| - |\bar{S}| - 2 = m+n-h-2.$$

Let $1 \le \mu_1 < \mu_2 < \cdots < \mu_r \le n$ be all integers such that

$$\bar{a}_1 - \bar{b}_{\mu_1}, \bar{a}_1 - \bar{b}_{\mu_2}, \ldots, \bar{a}_1 - \bar{b}_{\mu_r} \in \bar{S}.$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$\bar{a}_1 - \bar{b}_{\mu_k} = \bar{s}_k$$

for each $1 \le k \le r$. Then by the induction hypothesis,

$$|(a_1 + \mathcal{A}_1) \overset{s_k+\mathcal{S}_k}{+} (b_{\mu_k} + \mathcal{B}_{\mu_k})| = |\mathcal{A}_1 \overset{\mathcal{S}_k^*}{+} \mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}| \ge |\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}| - 3|\mathcal{S}_k|,$$

where $\mathcal{S}_k^* = (b_{\mu_k} - a_1) + s_k + \mathcal{S}_k$.

Let

$$\mathfrak{T} = (\bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}) \setminus \{\bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_1, \ldots, \bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_n\}$$

and let $\tau = |\mathfrak{T}|$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 that

$$\tau = |\mathfrak{T}| \ge |\bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}| - n \ge m - h - 2.$$

We may assume that

$$\bar{a}_{\gamma_1} + \bar{b}_{\eta_1}, \bar{a}_{\gamma_2} + \bar{b}_{\eta_2} \ldots, \bar{a}_{\gamma_\tau} + \bar{b}_{\eta_\tau}$$

are distinct elements of $\mathfrak{T}$, where $2 \le \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_\tau \le m$, $1 \le \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_\tau \le m$ and

$$\bar{a}_{\gamma_1} - \bar{b}_{\eta_1}, \bar{a}_{\gamma_2} - \bar{b}_{\eta_2} \ldots, \bar{a}_{\gamma_\tau} - \bar{b}_{\eta_\tau} \notin \bar{S}.$$

Further, in view of Lemma 2.2, if $m \ge h + 3$, we may assume

$$\gamma_j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, h + 2, j + h + 2\}$$

for each $1 \le j \le m - h - 2$. Clearly

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big(\bigcup_{k=1}^{r} \big((a_1 + \mathcal{A}_1) \overset{s_k+\mathcal{S}_k}{+} (b_{\mu_k} + \mathcal{B}_{\mu_k})\big) \Big) \\
\cup &\Big(\bigcup_{\substack{1 \le \nu \le n \\ \nu \notin \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_r\}}} \big((a_1 + \mathcal{A}_1) + (b_\nu + \mathcal{B}_\mu)\big) \Big) \\
\cup &\Big(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\tau} \big((a_{\gamma_j} + \mathcal{A}_{\gamma_j}) + (b_{\eta_j} + \mathcal{B}_{\eta_j})\big) \Big)
\end{aligned}$$

forms a disjoint union of a subset of $A \overset{S}{+} B$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq & \sum_{k=1}^{r} |\mathcal{A}_1 \overset{\mathcal{S}_k^*}{+} \mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}| + \sum_{\substack{1\leq \nu\leq n\\ \nu\notin\{\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_r\}}} |\mathcal{A}_1+\mathcal{B}_\nu| + \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} |\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_i}+\mathcal{B}_{\eta_j}|\\ \geq & \sum_{k=1}^{r}(|\mathcal{A}_1|+|\mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}|-3|\mathcal{S}_k|) + \sum_{\substack{1\leq \nu\leq n\\ \nu\notin\{\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_r\}}} (|\mathcal{A}_1|+|\mathcal{B}_\nu|-1) + \sum_{j=1}^{\tau}|\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_j}|\\ \geq & n|\mathcal{A}_1|+|B|+\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}|\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_j}| - 3\sum_{k=1}^{r}|\mathcal{S}_k| - (n-r). \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Evidently

$$3\sum_{k=1}^{r}|\mathcal{S}_k| - r \leq 3\sum_{k=1}^{h}|\mathcal{S}_k| - h = 3|S| - h.$$

Let

$$\Psi = n(|\mathcal{A}_1|-1)+|B|+\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}|\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_j}|.$$

Clearly (1.8) is true if we can show that

$$\Psi \geq |A|+|B|-h.$$

We need to consider the following four cases:

(I) $|\mathcal{A}_1| = 1$.

Note that now $|\mathcal{A}_1 \overset{\mathcal{S}_k^*}{+} \mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}|$ is greater than or equal to $|\mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}| - |\mathcal{S}_k|$, rather than $1 + |\mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}| - 3|\mathcal{S}_k|$. In view of (2.1),

$$\begin{aligned}|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq & \sum_{k=1}^{r}(|\mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}|-|\mathcal{S}_k|) + \sum_{\substack{1\leq \nu\leq n\\ \nu\notin\{\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_r\}}} |\mathcal{B}_\nu| + \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} 1\\ \geq & |B| + (m-h-2) - \sum_{k=1}^{r}(|\mathcal{S}_k|-1) \geq |A|+|B|-|S|-2.\end{aligned}$$

(II) $|\mathcal{A}_1| \geq 2$ and $n \geq h+4$.

Suppose that $m \geq h+3$. Recall that for each $j = 1,\ldots,m-h-2$, $\gamma_j \in \{2, h+2, j+h+2\}$, i.e., $\gamma_j \geq j+h+2$. So

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}|\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_k}| \geq \sum_{j=1}^{m-h-2}|\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_j}| \geq \sum_{k=h+3}^{m}|\mathcal{A}_k|.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi =&n(|\mathcal{A}_1|-1)+|B|+\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}|\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_k}|\\ \geq&(h+2)|\mathcal{A}_1|-(h+2)+\sum_{k=h+3}^{m}|\mathcal{A}_k|+|B|+(n-h-2)(|\mathcal{A}_1|-1)\\ \geq&|A|+|B|-h. \end{aligned}\tag{2.2}$$

And if $m\leq h+2$, we also have

$$\Psi\geq n(|\mathcal{A}_1|-1)+|B|\geq m|\mathcal{A}_1|-m+|B|+(n-m)\geq|A|+|B|-h.$$

(III) $|\mathcal{A}_1|\geq 2$, $n\leq h+3$ and $m\geq h+2$.

Suppose that

$$|\bar{A}\overset{\bar{S}}{+}\bar{B}|\geq m+n-h-1,$$

i.e., $\tau\geq m-h-1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi \geq&m(|\mathcal{A}_1|-1)+|B|+\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}|\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_k}|\\ \geq&((m-1)|\mathcal{A}_1|+2)-m+|B|+(|\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_1}|+(\tau-1))\geq|A|+|B|-h. \end{aligned}\tag{2.3}$$

So we may assume that $|\bar{A}\overset{\bar{S}}{+}\bar{B}|=m+n-h-2$, i.e., $\tau\geq m-h-2$. Let

$$\mathfrak{J}=\{\bar{a}_j:\ |\mathcal{A}_j|\leq|\mathcal{A}_1|-1,\ 1\leq j\leq m\}.$$

If $|\mathfrak{J}|\geq 2$, then we get $m|\mathcal{A}_1|\geq|A|+2$. Thus

$$\Psi\geq m|\mathcal{A}_1|+|B|+\tau-m\geq|A|+|B|-h.$$

Therefore we may assume that $|\mathfrak{J}|\leq 1$.

Assume that there exist $1\leq j\leq m$ and $1\leq k\leq n$ such that

$$\bar{a}_j+\bar{b}_k\notin\bar{A}\overset{\bar{S}}{+}\bar{B}\qquad\text{and}\qquad|\mathcal{A}_j|=|\mathcal{A}_1|.\tag{2.4}$$

Then we can exchange $a_1+\mathcal{A}_1$ and $a_j+\mathcal{A}_j$, i.e., set $\bar{a}_j$ as the new $\bar{a}_1$. Since $\bar{a}_1+\bar{b}_k\notin\bar{A}\overset{\bar{S}}{+}\bar{B}$ now , we get

$$\tau=\left|(\bar{A}\overset{\bar{S}}{+}\bar{B})\setminus\{\bar{a}_1+\bar{b}_1,\ldots,\bar{a}_1+\bar{b}_n\}\right|\geq(m+n-h-2)-(n-1)=m-h-1.$$

By (2.3), we also have

$$\Psi\geq m(|\mathcal{A}_1|-1)+|B|+\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}|\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_j}|\geq|A|+|B|-h.$$

We still need to find j, k satisfying the assumption (2.4). Clearly we may assume that $|\bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}| < p(G)$, otherwise we immediately get $|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq p(G)$. Suppose that $m + n - 1 \leq p(G)$. Then

$$|\bar{A} + \bar{B}| - |\bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}| \geq (m + n - 1) - (m + n - h - 2) = h + 1.$$

Since $|\mathfrak{J}| \leq 1$, we have $|\mathfrak{J} + \bar{S}| \leq h$. So there exist $1 \leq j \leq m$ and $1 \leq k \leq n$ such that $\bar{a}_j + \bar{b}_k \notin \bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}$ and $\bar{a}_j \notin \mathfrak{J}$, i.e., $|\mathcal{A}_j| = |\mathcal{A}_1|$.

Suppose that $m + n - 1 > p(G)$, i.e., $(m - 1) + n - 1 \geq p(G)$. Then

$$(\bar{A} \setminus \mathfrak{J}) + \bar{B} = G/H \supsetneq \bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}.$$

We also can find $\bar{a}_j + \bar{b}_k \notin \bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}$ with $\bar{a}_j \notin \mathfrak{J}$.

(IV) $|\mathcal{A}_1| \geq 2$, $n \leq h + 3$ and $m \leq h + 1$.

Suppose that $\tau \geq 1$. From (2.3), we know that

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi \geq & \big((m-1)|\mathcal{A}_1| + 2\big) + |B| + \big((\tau - 1) + \mathcal{A}_{\gamma_1}\big) - m \\ \geq & |A| + |B| - h + 1.\end{aligned}$$

And if there exists $1 \leq j \leq m$ such that $|\mathcal{A}_j| \leq |\mathcal{A}_1| - 1$, then we also have

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi \geq & m|\mathcal{A}_1| + |B| - m \\ \geq & \big(|A| + 1\big) + |B| - (h + 1) = |A| + |B| - h.\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we get

$$\Psi \geq n(|\mathcal{A}_1| - 1) + |B| \geq m(|\mathcal{A}_1| - 1) + |B| + (n - m) \geq |A| + |B| - h$$

provided that $n \leq h$ or $n > m$.

Below we assume that

$$\tau = 0 \qquad , |\mathcal{A}_1| = \cdots = |\mathcal{A}_m|, \qquad n = m = h + 1.$$

This is the most difficult part of the proof of Theorem 1.1. Clearly we may set $\bar{a}_1 = \bar{a}$ for any $\bar{a} \in \bar{A}$. Assume that $|\bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}| < p(G)$. Note that $\tau = 0$ implies

$$\bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B} \subseteq \{\bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_1, \ldots, \bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_m\},$$

On the other hand, since

$$|\bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}| < \min\{2m - 1, p(G)\} \leq |\bar{A} + \bar{B}|,$$

we may choose $\bar{a}_1 = \bar{a} \in \bar{A}$ and $\bar{b}_\mu \in \bar{B}$ such that $\bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_\mu \notin \bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}$. So

$$\bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B} \subseteq \{\bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_k : 1 \leq k \leq m,\ k \neq \mu\}.$$

But

$$|\bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}| \geq 2m - h - 2 = h = m - 1.$$

We must have

$$\bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B} = \{\bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_k : 1 \leq k \leq m,\ k \neq \mu\},$$

i.e., $|\bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}| = m - 1$.

Arbitrarily choose $\bar{a} \in \bar{A}$ as $\bar{a}_1$. Assume that

$$\bar{a}_1 - \bar{b}_{\mu_k} = \bar{s}_{\lambda_k}, \qquad 1 \leq k \leq r$$

and

$$\bar{a}_1 - \bar{b}_\nu \notin \bar{S}, \qquad \nu \notin \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_r\}.$$

Without loss of generality, assume that $\bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_{\mu_1} \notin \bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}$, i.e., $\bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B} = \{\bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_k : k \neq \mu_1\}$. Letting $\mathcal{S}^*_{\lambda_k} = (b_k - a_k) + s_{\lambda_k} + \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_k}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq & \sum_{k=1}^{r} |\mathcal{A}_1 \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\lambda_k}}{+} \mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}| + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq \nu \leq m \\ \nu \notin \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_r\}}} |\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{B}_\nu| \\
\geq & \sum_{k=1}^{r} (|\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}| - 3|\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_k}|) + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq \nu \leq m \\ \nu \notin \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_r\}}} (|\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_\nu| - 1) \\
= & m(|\mathcal{A}_1| - 1) + \sum_{k=1}^{m} |\mathcal{B}_k| - \sum_{k=1}^{r} (3|\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_k}| - 1). \qquad (2.5)
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq |A| + |B| - m - 3|S| + h + \delta = |A| + |B| - 3|S| - 1 + \delta, \qquad (2.6)$$

where $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\delta = 1$ if none of the following conditions is true:

(a) $r = h$;

(b) $|\mathcal{A}_1 \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\lambda_k}}{+} \mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}| = |\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}| - 3|\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_k}|$ for each $1 \leq k \leq h$;

(c) $|\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{B}_\nu| = |\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_\nu| - 1$ for the unique $\nu \notin \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_h\}$.

Suppose that there exists some $\bar{a} \in \bar{A}$ such that $\delta = 1$ when $\bar{a}_1 = \bar{a}$, i.e., at least one of (a)-(c) fails. Evidently by (2.6), we immediately get (1.8). Assume that for any $\bar{a} \in \bar{A}$, we always have $\delta = 0$ if $\bar{a}_1 = \bar{a}$, i.e., (a)-(c) all hold.

For each $2 \leq i \leq m$, it is impossible that

$$\bar{a}_i - \bar{b}_\nu \notin \bar{S},$$

where $1 \leq \nu \leq m$ is the unique one satisfying $\bar{a}_1 - \bar{b}_\nu \notin \bar{S}$. Otherwise, by (a), we also can get

$$\{\bar{b}_k : 1 \leq k \leq m,\ k \neq \nu\} = \bar{a}_i - \bar{S}.$$

It follows that

$$\bar{a}_i - \bar{a}_1 + \bar{S} = \bar{S},$$

i.e., $\bar{S} = G/H$. This contradicts our assumption $h < m \le p(G)$.

Below we need to the following inverse theorem of Károlyi [11, Theorem 4].

Lemma 2.3. *Let A and B be non-empty subsets of a finite group G. Suppose that $|A+B| = |A| + |B| - 1 \le p(G) - 1$. Then the following one holds:*

(1) $|A| = 1$ or $|B| = 1$;

(2) A and B are two arithmetic progressions with the common difference, i.e., $A = \{a, a+q, \dots, a+(k-1)q\}$ and $B = \{b, q+b, \dots, (l-1)q+b\}$;

(3) $A \subseteq a + K$ and $B \subseteq K + b$, where K is a subgroup of G of order $p(G)$.

Since $|\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_\nu| > p(H)$ implies $|A \overset{S}{+} B| \ge |\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{B}_\nu| \ge p(H)$, we may assume that

$$|\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_\nu| \le p(H). \tag{2.7}$$

By (c), we get

$$|\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{B}_\nu| = |\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_\nu| - 1. \tag{2.8}$$

By Lemma 2.3 and (2.8), we must have $|\mathcal{B}_\nu| = 1$, or $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_\nu$ are the arithmetic progressions with the common difference, or $\mathcal{A}_1 = \alpha + K$ and $\mathcal{B}_\nu = \beta + K$ where K is a subgroup of H of order $p(H)$.

For each $2 \le i \le m$, since $\bar{a}_i - \bar{b}_\nu \in \bar{S}$, we may assume that $\bar{a}_i - \bar{b}_\nu = \bar{s}_{\kappa_i}$ for some $1 \le \kappa_i \le h$. And there exists a unique $1 \le \upsilon_i \le m$ such that $\bar{a}_i + \bar{b}_{\upsilon_i} \notin \bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}$. Note that (a)-(c) are still valid even if we exchange $a_1 + \mathcal{A}_1$ and $a_i + \mathcal{A}_i$. It follows from (b) and (c) that

$$|\mathcal{A}_i \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\kappa_i}}{+} \mathcal{B}_\nu| = |\mathcal{A}_i| + |\mathcal{B}_\nu| - 3|\mathcal{S}^*_{\kappa_i}| \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$|\mathcal{A}_i| + \mathcal{B}_{\upsilon_i}| = |\mathcal{A}_i| + |\mathcal{B}_{\upsilon_i}| - 1, \tag{2.10}$$

where $\mathcal{S}^*_{\kappa_i} = s_{\kappa_i} + b_m - a_2 + \mathcal{S}_{\kappa_i}$.

According to Lemma 2.3, there are four sub-cases:

(i) $|\mathcal{B}_\nu| = 1$.

Trivially

$$|\mathcal{A}_i \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\kappa_i}}{+} \mathcal{B}_\nu| = |\mathcal{A}_i| - |\mathcal{S}_{\kappa_i}| > |\mathcal{A}_2| + |\mathcal{B}_\nu| - 3|\mathcal{S}_{\kappa_i}|,$$

which evidently contradicts (2.9).

(ii) There exist the subgroups K_1, K_2 of H of order $p(H)$ and $\alpha, \beta \in H$ such that $\mathcal{A}_i \subseteq \alpha + K_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_\nu \subseteq \beta + K_2$.

Since $|K_1| = |K_2| = p(H)$, either $K_1 = K_2$ or $|K_1 \cap K_2| = 1$. If $|K_1 \cap K_2| = 1$, it is easy to see that

$$|\mathcal{A}_i + \mathcal{B}_\nu| = |(\mathcal{A}_i - \alpha) + (\mathcal{B}_\nu - \beta)| = |\mathcal{A}_i| \cdot |\mathcal{B}_\nu|.$$

Similarly, $|\mathcal{A}_i - \mathcal{B}_\nu| = |\mathcal{A}_i| \cdot |\mathcal{B}_\nu|$. So

$$|\{(a, b) : a - b \in \mathcal{S}^*_{\kappa_i},\ a \in \mathcal{A}_i,\ b \in \mathcal{B}_\nu\}| \le |\mathcal{S}^*_{\kappa_i}|.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{A}_i \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\kappa_i}}{+} \mathcal{B}_\nu| \ge& |\mathcal{A}_i| \cdot |\mathcal{B}_\nu| - |\mathcal{S}_{\kappa_i}| \\ \ge& |\mathcal{A}_i| + |\mathcal{B}_\nu| - |\mathcal{S}_{\kappa_i}| - 1 > |\mathcal{A}_i| + |\mathcal{B}_\nu| - 3|\mathcal{S}_{\kappa_i}|.\end{aligned}$$

Suppose that $K_1 = K_2$. Then letting $\mathcal{S}^\circ_{\kappa_i} = (\beta - \alpha + \mathcal{S}^*_{\kappa_i}) \cap K_1$ and applying Lemma 2.1 , we get

$$|\mathcal{A}_i \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\kappa_i}}{+} \mathcal{B}_\nu| = |(\mathcal{A}_2 - \alpha) \overset{\mathcal{S}^\circ_{\kappa_i}}{+} (\mathcal{B}_m - \beta)| \ge |\mathcal{A}_i| + |\mathcal{B}_\nu| - |\mathcal{S}^\circ_{\kappa_i}| - 2.$$

From (2.9), we obtain that $|\mathcal{S}_{\kappa_i}| = 1$.

(iii) Either $\mathcal{A}_i$ is an arithmetic progression and $\mathcal{B}_\nu \subseteq \beta + K$ where K is a subgroup of H, or $\mathcal{A}_i = \alpha + K$ and $\mathcal{B}_\nu$ is an arithmetic progression.

We only need to consider the first possibility, i.e., $\mathcal{A}_i = \{a, a+q, \ldots, a+(d-1)q\}$ and $\mathcal{B}_\nu = \beta + K$. If $q \in K$, then $\mathcal{A}_i \in a + K$. By the discussion in Case (ii), we can get that $|\mathcal{S}_{\kappa_i}| = 1$.

Suppose that $q \notin K$. Since $|\mathcal{A}_i| = d < p(H)$ by (2.7), $a+K, \ldots, a+(d-1)q+K$ must be disjoint cosets of K. Otherwise, we can get $d \ge [\langle q, K\rangle : K] \ge p(H)$, where $\langle q, K\rangle$ denotes the subgroup generated by q and K. Write

$$\mathcal{S}^*_{\kappa_i} = \bigcup_{j=1}^{h^*} (t_j + \mathcal{T}_j),$$

where $\mathcal{T}_j \subseteq K$ and $t_j - t_k \notin K$ if $j \ne k$. Assume that $a + \mu^*_k q - t_k \in K$ for $1 \le k \le r^*$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{A}_i \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\kappa_i}}{+} \mathcal{B}_\nu| \ge& \sum_{k=1}^{r^*} (|\mathcal{B}_\nu| - |\mathcal{T}_k|) + |B_\nu| \cdot (d - r^*) \\ =& d|\mathcal{B}_\nu| - \sum_{k=1}^{r^*} |\mathcal{T}_k| \ge |\mathcal{A}_i| + |\mathcal{B}_\nu| - |\mathcal{S}_{\kappa_i}| - 1.\end{aligned}$$

(iv) Both $\mathcal{A}_i$ and $\mathcal{B}_\nu$ are arithmetic progressions.

Write

$$\mathcal{A}_i = \{a_1 + kq_1 : 0 \le k \le d_1 - 1\}, \qquad \mathcal{B}_\nu = \{a_2 + kq_2 : 0 \le k \le d_2 - 1\}.$$

Let $\langle q\rangle$ denote the subgroup generated by q. If $q_1 \notin \langle q_2\rangle$, then $\mathcal{B}_\nu \subseteq a_2 + \langle q_2\rangle$ and $a_1 + \langle q_2\rangle, \dots, a_1 + (d_1-1)q_1 + \langle q_2\rangle$ are disjoint cosets of $\langle q_2\rangle$. According to the discussion in Case (iii), we can get $|\mathcal{A}_i \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\kappa_i}}{+} \mathcal{B}_\nu| \ge |\mathcal{A}_i| + |\mathcal{B}_\nu| - |\mathcal{S}_{\kappa_i}| - 1$. Similarly, the same result can be deduced from the assumption $q_2 \notin \langle q_1\rangle$, too.

Suppose that $\langle q_1\rangle = \langle q_2\rangle$. Let K be a maximal proper subgroup of $\langle q_1\rangle$, i.e., $[\langle q_1\rangle : K]$ is prime. Let

$$\mathcal{A}^\circ = \mathcal{A}_i - a_1, \qquad \mathcal{B}^\circ = \mathcal{B}_\nu - a_2, \qquad \mathcal{S}^\circ = (a_2 - a_1 + \mathcal{S}^*_{\kappa_i}) \cap K.$$

Clearly $|\mathcal{A}_i \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\kappa_i}}{+} \mathcal{B}_\nu| = |\mathcal{A}^\circ \overset{\mathcal{S}^\circ}{+} \mathcal{B}^\circ|$. Let

$$\widehat{\mathcal{A}}^\circ = \{a + K : a \in \mathcal{A}^\circ\}, \quad \widehat{\mathcal{B}}^\circ = \{b + K : b \in \mathcal{B}^\circ\}, \quad \widehat{\mathcal{S}}^\circ = \{s + K : s \in \mathcal{S}^\circ\}.$$

Since $q_1, q_2 \notin K$, we have $|\widehat{\mathcal{A}}^\circ| = |\mathcal{A}^\circ|$, $|\widehat{\mathcal{B}}^\circ| = |\mathcal{B}^\circ|$ and $|\widehat{\mathcal{S}}^\circ| \le |\mathcal{S}^\circ|$. Since $[\langle q_1\rangle : K]$ is prime, by Lemma 2.1, we get

$$|\mathcal{A}_i \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\kappa_i}}{+} \mathcal{B}_\nu| \ge |\widehat{\mathcal{A}}^\circ \overset{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}^\circ}{+} \widehat{\mathcal{B}}^\circ| \ge |\widehat{\mathcal{A}}^\circ| + |\widehat{\mathcal{B}}^\circ| - |\widehat{\mathcal{S}}^\circ| - 2 \ge |\mathcal{A}_i| + |\mathcal{B}_\nu| - |\mathcal{S}_{\kappa_i}| - 2,$$

which implies $|\mathcal{S}_{\kappa_i}| = 1$ by (2.9).

Now we have deduced that either

$$|\mathcal{A}_i \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\kappa_i}}{+} \mathcal{B}_\nu| \ge |\mathcal{A}_i| + |\mathcal{B}_\nu| - |\mathcal{S}_{\kappa_i}| - 1 > |\mathcal{A}_i| + |\mathcal{B}_\nu| - 3|\mathcal{S}_{\kappa_i}|$$

which leads to a contradiction to (2.9), or

$$|\mathcal{A}_i \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\kappa_i}}{+} \mathcal{B}_\nu| = |\mathcal{A}_i| + |\mathcal{B}_\nu| - |\mathcal{S}_{\kappa_i}| - 2$$

which implies $|\mathcal{S}_{\kappa_i}| = 1$ from (2.9). Since $\bar{a}_i - \bar{b}_\nu \in \bar{S}$ for each $2 \le i \le m$, we get $\{\bar{a}_2, \dots, \bar{a}_m\} = \bar{b}_\nu + \bar{S}$. Hence we must have

$$|\mathcal{S}_k| = 1$$

for each $1 \le k \le h$.

If $m = h + 1 < p(G)$, then

$$|\bar{A} + \bar{B}| \ge \min\{2m - 1, p(G)\} > m.$$

So there exist $2 \le j \le m$ and $1 \le k \le m$ such that

$$\bar{a}_j + \bar{b}_k \in (\bar{A} + \bar{B}) \setminus \{\bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_m\}.$$

Assume that $\bar{a}_j - \bar{b}_k = \bar{s}_{\lambda_0}$. Let $\mathcal{S}^*_{\lambda_0} = s_{\lambda_0} + b_k - a_j + \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_0}$. In view of (2.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |A \overset{S}{+} B| \ge & |\mathcal{A}_j \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\lambda_0}}{+} \mathcal{B}_k| + \sum_{k=1}^{r} |\mathcal{A}_1 \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\lambda_k}}{+} \mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}| + \sum_{\substack{1 \le \nu \le m \\ \nu \notin \{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r\}}} |\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{B}_\nu| \\ \ge & |\mathcal{A}_j \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\lambda_0}}{+} \mathcal{B}_k| + |A| + |B| - 3|S| - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|\mathcal{A}_j| \geq 2$ and $|\mathcal{S}^*_{\lambda_0}| = 1$, $\mathcal{A}_j \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\lambda_0}}{+} \mathcal{B}_k \neq \emptyset$, i.e., $|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq |A| + |B| - 3|S|$.

Suppose that $m = p(G)$. Then we also have $\mathcal{A}_1 \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\lambda_1}}{+} \mathcal{B}_{\mu_1} \neq \emptyset$. Recall that $\bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B} = \{\bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_k : 1 \leq k \leq m,\ k \neq \mu_1\}$. We get

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq |\mathcal{A}_1 \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\lambda_1}}{+} \mathcal{B}_{\mu_1}| + (m-1) \geq p(G).$$

□

Let us briefly explain how to extend Theorem 1.1 to finite non-commutative groups. Suppose that G is a finite group and H is a non-trivial subgroup of G. Note that for $a, b \in G$ and $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq H$,

$$(a + \mathcal{A}) + (b + \mathcal{B}) = (a + b) + \big(\psi_b(\mathcal{A}) + \mathcal{B}\big),$$

where $\psi_b : x \mapsto -b + x + b$ is an inner automorphism of G. So we have to study the restricted sumset

$$A \overset{\sigma,S}{+} B := \{a + b : a \in A,\ b \in B,\ a - \sigma(b) \notin S\},$$

where σ is an automorphism of G. If $a - b \in s + H$ and $\mathcal{S} \subseteq H$, then we have

$$(a + \mathcal{A}) \overset{\sigma,s+\mathcal{S}}{+} (b + \mathcal{B}) = (a + b) + (\psi_b(\mathcal{A}) \overset{\psi_b\sigma,\mathcal{S}^*}{+} \mathcal{B}),$$

where $\mathcal{S}^* = \psi_{\sigma(b)+b}\big((\psi_b - a) + s + \mathcal{S}\big)$.

On the other hand, in order to use the induction process, Balister and Wheeler proved the following lemma.

Lemma 2.4 ([4, Theorem 3.2])**.** *Suppose that G is a finite group of odd order and σ is an automorphism of G. Then there exists a proper normal subgroup H of G satisfying that*

(1) $\sigma(H) = H$.

(2) G/H is isomorphic to the additive group of some finite field $\mathbb{F}_{p^\alpha}$.

(3) Let χ denote the isomorphism from G/H to the additive group of $\mathbb{F}_{p^\alpha}$.

Then there exists some $\gamma \in \mathbb{F}_{p^\alpha} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\chi(\sigma(\bar{a})) = \gamma \cdot \chi(\bar{a})$ for each $\bar{a} \in G/H$.

With help of Lemmas 2.1, 2.3 and 2.4, we can obtain that the following generalization of Theorem 1.1 for general finite groups.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that A, B and S are non-empty subsets of a finite group G. Let σ be an automorphism of G with odd order. Then*

$$|A \overset{\sigma,S}{+} B| \geq \min\{|A| + |B| - 3|S|, p(G)\}. \tag{2.11}$$

3. Proof of Theorem 1.2 for $\mathbb{Z}_{p^\alpha}$

Lemma 3.1. *Let p be a prime and $\alpha \geq 1$. Suppose that A, B, S are non-empty subsets of $\mathbb{Z}_{p^\alpha}$. Then*

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq \min\{|A| + |B| - 2|S| - 1, p\}.$$

Proof. See [14, Remark 1.3]. □

Lemma 3.2 ([6, Lemma 2.1])**.** *Suppose that $A = \{a_1, \ldots, a_m\}$ and $B = \{b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$ are non-empty subsets of a finite abelian group G. If $m + n - 1 \leq p(G)$, then the set $(A + B) \setminus \{a_1 + b_1, \ldots, a_1 + b_n\}$ contains the distinct elements*

$$a_2 + b_{j_2}, a_3 + b_{j_3}, \ldots, a_{i_m} + b_{j_m}.$$

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that $A = \{a_1, \ldots, a_m\}$, $B = \{b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$ and S are non-empty subsets of a finite abelian group G. Let $h = |S|$ and suppose that $m \geq 3h+1$. If $m + n - 3h \leq p(G)$ and $h < p(G)$, then the set $(A \overset{S}{+} B) \setminus \{a_1 + b_1, \ldots, a_1 + b_n\}$ contains the distinct elements*

$$a_{i_1} + b_{j_1}, a_{i_2} + b_{j_2}, \ldots, a_{i_{m-3h}} + b_{j_{m-3h}}$$

such that for each $1 \leq k \leq m - 3h$

$$i_k \in \{2, 3, \ldots, 3h, k + 3h\}.$$

Proof. This lemma immediately follows from Theorem 1.1 by using the same discussions in the proof of Lemma 3.1. □

Proposition 3.1. *Let A, B, S be non-empty subsets of $\mathbb{Z}_{p^\alpha}$. Suppose that*

$$\min\{|A|, |B|\} \geq 6|S|^2 - 5.$$

Then

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq \min\{|A| + |B| - |S| - 2, p\}. \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. We use an induction on α. Assume that the assertion of Proposition 3.1 is true for $\mathbb{Z}_{p^{\alpha-1}}$. In view of (1.6), we alway assume that $|S| \geq 2$. Note that

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq |A| - |S| \geq 6|S|^2 - |S| - 5 \geq |S|$$

when $|S| \geq 2$. So we only need to consider that case $|S| < p$.

Let H be the subgroup of $\mathbb{Z}_{p^\alpha}$ of order p. For $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^\alpha}$, let $\bar{x}$ denote the coset $x + H$, and let $\bar{X} := \{\bar{x} : x \in X\}$ for $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{p^\alpha}$. Assume that

$$\bar{A} = \{\bar{a}_1, \ldots, \bar{a}_m\}, \qquad \bar{B} = \{\bar{b}_1, \ldots, \bar{b}_n\}, \qquad \bar{S} = \{\bar{s}_1, \ldots, \bar{s}_h\}.$$

By exchanging A and B, we may assume that $m \leq n$. Write

$$A = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} (a_i + \mathcal{A}_i), \qquad B = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} (b_i + \mathcal{B}_i), \qquad S = \bigcup_{i=1}^{h} (s_i + \mathcal{S}_i),$$

where those $\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{B}_i, \mathcal{S}_i \subseteq H$. Moreover, assume that

$$|\mathcal{A}_1| \geq |\mathcal{A}_2| \geq \cdots \geq |\mathcal{A}_m|, \qquad |\mathcal{B}_1| \geq |\mathcal{B}_2| \geq \cdots \geq |\mathcal{B}_n|.$$

Suppose that $m = n = 1$. Let $\mathcal{T} = (b_1 - a_1) + s_i + \mathcal{S}_i$ if $\bar{a}_1 - \bar{b}_1 = \bar{s}_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq h$, and let $\mathcal{T} = \emptyset$ if $\bar{a}_1 - \bar{b}_1 \notin \bar{\mathcal{S}}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |A \overset{S}{+} B| = |\mathcal{A}_1 \overset{\mathcal{T}}{+} \mathcal{B}_1| \geq & \min\{|\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_1| - |\mathcal{T}| - 2, p\} \\ \geq & \min\{|A| + |B| - |S| - 2, p\}. \end{aligned}$$

Below we always assume that either $m > 1$, or $n > m$.

(I) $|\mathcal{A}_1| \geq 2$.

Assume that $\bar{a}_1 - \bar{b}_{\mu_k} = \bar{s}_{\lambda_k}$ for each $1 \leq k \leq r$, and $\bar{a}_1 - \bar{b}_\nu \notin \bar{S}$ if $1 \leq \nu \leq n$ and $\nu \notin \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_r\}$. Let $\tau = |(\bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}) \setminus \{\bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_1, \ldots, \bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_n\}|$. By Lemma 3.1, we have $\tau \geq \max\{m - 2h - 1, 0\}$. Furthermore, when $m \geq 2h + 2$, we may assume that $\bar{a}_{\gamma_1} + \bar{b}_{\eta_1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{\gamma_{m-3h}} + \bar{b}_{\eta_{m-2h-1}}$ are distinct elements of $(\bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}) \setminus (\bar{a}_1 + \bar{B})$ with $\gamma_j \leq j + 2h + 1$ for each $1 \leq j \leq m - 2h - 1$.

Letting $\mathcal{S}^*_{\lambda_k} = (b_{\mu_k} - a_k) + s_{\lambda_k} + \mathcal{S}_{\lambda_k}$, we have

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq \sum_{k=1}^{r} |\mathcal{A}_1 \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\lambda_k}}{+} \mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}| + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq \nu \leq m \\ \nu \notin \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_r\}}} |\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{B}_\nu| + \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} |\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_j} + \mathcal{B}_{\eta_j}|.$$

We may assume that those

$$|\mathcal{A}_1 \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\lambda_k}}{+} \mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}|, \ |\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{B}_\nu|, \ |\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_j} + \mathcal{B}_{\eta_j}| < p,$$

otherwise we immediately get $|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq p$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq & \sum_{k=1}^{r} (|\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}| - |\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_k}| - 2) + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq \nu \leq m \\ \nu \notin \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_r\}}} (|\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_\nu| - 1) + \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} |\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_j}| \\ \geq & n|\mathcal{A}_1| + |B| + \sum_{j=1}^{m-3h} |\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_j}| - \sum_{k=1}^{r} (|\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_k}| + 1) - n. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

When $m \geq 2h + 2$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} |A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq & (2h+1)|\mathcal{A}_1| + \sum_{i=2h+2}^{m} |\mathcal{A}_i| + |B| + (n - 2h - 1)|\mathcal{A}_1| - n - \sum_{k=1}^{h} (|\mathcal{S}_k| + 1) \\ \geq & |A| + |B| - |S| - 2 + \big((n - 2h - 1)|\mathcal{A}_1| - n - h + 2\big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

While if $m \le 2h+1$, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}|A \overset{S}{+} B| \ge& n|\mathcal{A}_1| + |B| - \sum_{k=1}^{r}(|\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_k}|+1) - n\\ \ge& m|\mathcal{A}_1| + |B| + (n-m)|\mathcal{A}_1| - \sum_{k=1}^{h}(|\mathcal{S}_k|+1) - n\\ \ge& |A| + |B| - |S| - 2 + \big((n-m)|\mathcal{A}_1| - n - h + 2\big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

If $n \ge 5h$, then

$$(n-2h-1)|\mathcal{A}_1| - n - h + 2 \ge 2(n-2h-1) - n - h + 2 \ge 0.$$

Below assume that $n \le 5h-1$. Note that the function $(x-2h-1)|A|/x - x$ is increasing on $(0, \sqrt{(2h+1)|A|}]$ and is decreasing on $[\sqrt{(2h+1)|A|}, +\infty)$. Since $m|\mathcal{A}_1| \ge |A|$,

$$\begin{aligned}(n-2h-1)|\mathcal{A}_1| - n \ge& (n-2h-1)\cdot\frac{|A|}{m} - n\\ \ge& (n-2h-1)\cdot\frac{|A|}{n} - n\\ \ge& \min\left\{\frac{|A|}{2h+2} - (2h+2),\ \frac{(3h-2)|A|}{5h-1} - (5h-1)\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

(i) $|S| \ge h+1$.

Suppose that $m \ge 2h+2$. Since $|A| \ge 6|S|^2 - 5 > 6h(h+2)$, we have

$$\frac{|A|}{2h+2} - (2h+2) \ge 3h - (2h-2) = h-2.$$

And it is easy to check

$$\frac{(3h-2)|A|}{5h-1} - (5h-1) \ge \frac{(3h-2)\cdot 6h(h+2)}{5h-1} - 5h + 1 \ge h-2$$

for any $h \ge 1$. Hence we have $|A \overset{S}{+} B| \ge |A| + |B| - |S| - 2$ when $|S| > h$.

Suppose that $m \le 2h+1$ and $m < n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(n-m)|\mathcal{A}_1| - n \ge& \frac{n-m}{m}\cdot|A| - n \ge \frac{|A|}{m} - m - 1\\ \ge& \frac{|A|}{2h+1} - (2h+1) - 1 \ge \frac{6h(h+2)}{2h+1} - 2h - 2 \ge h-2.\end{aligned}$$

From (3.4), we also can get $|A \overset{S}{+} B| \ge |A| + |B| - |S| - 2$.

Suppose that $m = n \le 2h+1$. Since $|\bar{A}+\bar{B}| \ge m+1$, there exist $1 \le \gamma, \eta \le h$ such that $\bar{a}_\gamma + \bar{b}_\eta \notin \{\bar{a}_1+\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_1+\bar{b}_m\}$. Let $\mathcal{T} = (b_\eta - a_\gamma) + s_i + \mathcal{S}_i$ if $\bar{a}_\gamma - \bar{b}_\eta = \bar{s}_i$, and let $\mathcal{T} = \emptyset$ if $\bar{a}_\gamma - \bar{b}_\eta \notin \bar{S}$. Clearly

$$|\mathcal{T}| \le \max_{1\le i\le h} |\mathcal{S}_i| \le |S| - h + 1.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |A \overset{S}{+} B| \ge & \sum_{k=1}^{r} |\mathcal{A}_1 \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\lambda_k}}{+} \mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}| + \sum_{\substack{1\le\nu\le m \\ \nu\notin\{\mu_1,\dots,\mu_r\}}} |\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{B}_\nu| + |\mathcal{A}_\gamma \overset{\mathcal{T}}{+} \mathcal{B}_\eta| \\ \ge & m|\mathcal{A}_1| + |B| - |S| - h - n + (|\mathcal{A}_\gamma| - |\mathcal{T}|) \\ \ge & |A| + |B| - |S| - 2 + (|\mathcal{A}_1| - |S| - 2h). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$|A| \ge 6|S|(h+1) - 5 = 3|S|(2h+1) + 3|S| - 5 \ge (|S| + 2h)\cdot(2h+1).$$

We obtain that

$$|\mathcal{A}_1| \ge \frac{|A|}{m} \ge \frac{|A|}{2h+1} \ge |S| + 2h,$$

i.e., $|A \overset{S}{+} B| \ge |A| + |B| - |S| - 2$.

(ii) $|S| = h$.

Now $|\mathcal{S}_i| = 1$ for each $1 \le i \le h$. We shall use another way to give the lower bound of $|A \overset{S}{+} B|$ Since $h \ge 2$ and $|B| \ge 6h(h-1)$, in view of (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |A \overset{S}{+} B| \ge & n(|\mathcal{A}_1| - 1) + |B| + (m - 3h) - h - |S| \\ \ge & n + m + |B| - 5h \ge m + n + h. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

So we may assume that $m + n - 1 \le p$. According to Lemma 3.2, assume that $\bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_n, \bar{a}_2 + \bar{b}_{\upsilon_2}, \dots, \bar{a}_m + \bar{b}_{\upsilon_m}$ are distinct elements of $\bar{A} + \bar{B}$. For $2 \le j \le m$, let

$$\mathcal{T}_j = \begin{cases} (b_{\upsilon_j} - a_j) + s_i + \mathcal{S}_i, & \text{if } \bar{a}_j - \bar{b}_{\upsilon_j} = \bar{s}_i \text{ for some } 1 \le i \le h, \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } \bar{a}_j - \bar{b}_{\upsilon_j} \notin \bar{S}. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}|A \overset{S}{+} B| \ge& \sum_{k=1}^{r} |\mathcal{A}_1 \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\lambda_k}}{+} \mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}| + \sum_{\substack{1\le\nu\le m\\ \nu\notin\{\mu_1,\dots,\mu_r\}}} |\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{B}_\nu| + \sum_{j=2}^{m} |\mathcal{A}_j \overset{\mathcal{T}_j}{+} \mathcal{B}_{\upsilon_j}|\\ \ge& \sum_{k=1}^{r}(|\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}| - 3) + \sum_{\substack{1\le\nu\le m\\ \nu\notin\{\mu_1,\dots,\mu_r\}}} (|\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_\nu| - 1) + \sum_{j=2}^{m}(|\mathcal{A}_j| - 1)\\ \ge& |A| + |B| + (n-1)|\mathcal{A}_1| - 2h - n - (m-1)\\ \ge& |A| + |B| - |S| - 2 + \big((n-1)|\mathcal{A}_1| - 2n - h + 3\big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Recalling that $2 \le n \le 5h-1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(n-1)|\mathcal{A}_1| - 2n \ge& (n-1)\cdot\left\lceil\frac{|A|}{n}\right\rceil - 2n\\ \ge& \min\left\{\frac{(2-1)|A|}{2} - 2\cdot 2,\ (5h-2)\cdot\left\lceil\frac{|A|}{5h-1}\right\rceil - 2(5h-1)\right\},\end{aligned}$$

where $\lceil x\rceil$ denotes the least integer not less than x. It is easy to verify that

$$\frac{|A|}{2} - 4 \ge (3h^2-3) - 4 \ge h-3$$

for $h \ge 2$, and

$$\frac{(5h-2)|A|}{5h-1} - 2(5h-1) \ge \frac{(5h-2)\cdot(6h^2-5)}{5h-1} - 2(5h-1) \ge h-3$$

whenever $h \ge 2$. When $h = 2$, we also have

$$(5h-2)\cdot\left\lceil\frac{|A|}{5h-1}\right\rceil - 2(5h-1) = 8\cdot\left\lceil\frac{19}{9}\right\rceil - 18 = 6 > 2-3.$$

So by (3.6), we get the desired result.

(II) $|\mathcal{A}_1| = 1$.

Suppose that $|\mathcal{B}_1| \ge 2$. Since $|\mathcal{A}_1| = \cdots |\mathcal{A}_m| = 1$, we have

$$m = |A| \ge 6|S|^2 - 5 \ge 4h.$$

Assume that $1 \le \hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_{\hat{r}}$ are all integers such that $\bar{a}_{\hat{\mu}_k} - \bar{b}_1 = \bar{s}_{\hat{\lambda}_k} \in \bar{S}$ for $1 \le k \le \hat{r}$. And assume that $\bar{a}_{\hat{\gamma}_1} + \bar{b}_{\hat{\eta}_1}, \dots, \bar{a}_{\hat{\gamma}_{n-2h-1}} + \bar{b}_{\hat{\eta}_{n-2h-1}}$ are distinct elements of $(\bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}) \setminus \{\bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_m + \bar{b}_1\}$ with $\hat{\eta}_j \le j + 2h + 1$ for $1 \le j \le n - 2h - 1$.

Letting $\mathcal{S}^*_{\hat{\lambda}_k} = (b_1 - a_{\hat{\mu}_k}) + s_{\hat{\lambda}_k} + \mathcal{S}_{\hat{\lambda}_k}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq & \sum_{k=1}^{\hat{r}} |\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\mu}_k} \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\hat{\lambda}_k}}{+} \mathcal{B}_1| + \sum_{\substack{1\leq \hat{\nu}\leq m \\ \hat{\nu}\notin\{\hat{\mu}_1,\ldots,\hat{\mu}_{\hat{r}}\}}} |\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\nu}} + \mathcal{B}_1| + \sum_{j=1}^{n-2h-1} |\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\gamma}_j} + \mathcal{B}_{\hat{\eta}_j}| \\
\geq & \sum_{k=1}^{\hat{r}} (|\mathcal{B}_1| - |\mathcal{S}^*_{\hat{\lambda}_k}|) + \sum_{\substack{1\leq \hat{\nu}\leq m \\ \hat{\nu}\notin\{\hat{\mu}_1,\ldots,\hat{\mu}_{\hat{r}}\}}} |\mathcal{B}_1| + \sum_{j=1}^{n-2h-1} |\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\eta}_j}| \\
\geq & (2h+1)|\mathcal{B}_1| + \sum_{j=1}^{n-2h-1} |\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\eta}_j}| - |S| \geq |B| + (m-2h-1)|\mathcal{B}_1| - |S| \\
\geq & |B| + |A| + 2(m-2h-1) - |S| - m \geq |A| + |B| - |S| - 2. \qquad (3.7)
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, assume that $|\mathcal{B}_1| = 1$. Then by the induction hypothesis,

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq |\bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}| \geq |\bar{A}| + |\bar{B}| - |\bar{S}| - 2 \geq |A| + |B| - |S| - 2.$$

□

4. Proof of Theorem 1.2

By Proposition 3.1, there is nothing to do if $G = \mathbb{Z}_{p^\alpha}$. Suppose that G is not a cyclic group of prime power order. The case $|S| = 1$ easily follows from (1.6). Note that

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq |A| - |S| \geq 9|S|^2 - 6|S| - 3 = 3(3|S| + 1)(|S| - 1) \geq |S|$$

whenever $|S| \geq 2$. We always assume that $2 \leq |S| < p(G)$.

We use an induction on $|G|$. Assume that Theorem 1.2 holds for any abelian group whose order is less than $|G|$. For a subgroup H of G, define

$$\mathfrak{X}_{A,H} = \{a + H \in G/H : \ A \cap (a + H) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

We claim that

$$|\mathfrak{X}_{A,H}| \geq \sqrt{|A|}$$

for some subgroup $H \subseteq G$ of prime order. Since G is not a cyclic group of prime power order, we may write $G = K_1 \oplus K_2$ where $|K_1|, |K_2| > 1$. Assume that $|\mathfrak{X}_{A,K_1}| < \sqrt{|A|}$. By the pigeonhole principle, there exists a coset $a + K_1$ such that $A \cap (a + K_1) > \sqrt{A}$. Assume that $a + K_1 = \{b_1, \ldots, b_k\}$. It is easy to see that $b_1 + K_2, \ldots, b_k + K_2$ are distinct cosets of K_2. We get $|\mathfrak{X}_{A,K_2}| > \sqrt{|A|}$. So $\max\{|\mathfrak{X}_{A,K_1}|, |\mathfrak{X}_{A,K_2}|\} \geq \sqrt{|A|}$. Assume that $|\mathfrak{X}_{A,K_1}| \geq \sqrt{|A|}$ and let H be a subgroup of K_1 with $|H|$ is prime. Clearly we also have $|\mathfrak{X}_{A,H}| \geq \sqrt{|A|}$. Since

$$\min\{|A|, |B|\} \geq 9|S|^2 - 5|S| - 3,$$

we may assume that.

$$\max\{|\mathfrak{X}_{A,H}|, |\mathfrak{X}_{B,H}|\} \ge \sqrt{9|S|^2 - 5|S| - 3}.$$

Assume that

$$\bar{A} = \{\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_m\}, \qquad \bar{B} = \{\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_n\}, \qquad \bar{S} = \{\bar{s}_1, \dots, \bar{s}_h\},$$

where $\bar{a} = a + H$ and $\bar{A} = \mathfrak{X}_{A,H}$. Further, without loss of generality, assume that $n \ge m$. According to our choice of H, we know that $n \ge \sqrt{9|S|^2 - 5|S| - 3}$. Write

$$A = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m}(a_i + \mathcal{A}_i), \qquad B = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n}(b_i + \mathcal{B}_i), \qquad S = \bigcup_{i=1}^{h}(s_i + \mathcal{S}_i),$$

where

$$|\mathcal{A}_1| \ge |\mathcal{A}_2| \ge \cdots \ge |\mathcal{A}_m|, \qquad |\mathcal{B}_1| \ge |\mathcal{B}_2| \ge \cdots \ge |\mathcal{B}_n|.$$

If $m = n = 1$, then for some $1 \le i \le h$,

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \ge |\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_1| - |\mathcal{S}_i| - 2 \ge |A| + |B| - |S| - 2.$$

So below assume that either $m \ge 2$ or $m < n$.

(I) $|\mathcal{A}_1| \ge 2$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
|A \overset{S}{+} B| \ge& \sum_{k=1}^{r} |\mathcal{A}_1 \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\lambda_k}}{+} \mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}| + \sum_{\substack{1\le\nu\le m\\ \nu\notin\{\mu_1,\dots,\mu_r\}}} |\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{B}_\nu| + \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} |\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_j} + \mathcal{B}_{\eta_j}| \\
\ge& \sum_{k=1}^{r}(|\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}| - |\mathcal{S}_{\lambda_k}| - 2) + \sum_{\substack{1\le\nu\le m\\ \nu\notin\{\mu_1,\dots,\mu_r\}}} (|\mathcal{A}_1| + |\mathcal{B}_\nu| - 1) + \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} |\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_j}| \\
\ge& n|\mathcal{A}_1| + |B| + \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} |\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_j}| - \sum_{k=1}^{r}(|\mathcal{S}_k| + 1) - n, \qquad (4.1)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have assumed that those

$$|\mathcal{A}_1 \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\lambda_k}}{+} \mathcal{B}_{\mu_k}|,\ |\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{B}_\nu|,\ |\mathcal{A}_{\gamma_j} + \mathcal{B}_{\eta_j}| < p(G).$$

Suppose that $m \ge 3h + 1$. Then

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \ge |A| + |B| - |S| - 2 + \big((n - 3h)|\mathcal{A}_1| - n - h + 2\big), \qquad (4.2)$$

since $\tau \ge m - 3h$ now. And if $m \le 3h$, we also have

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \ge |A| + |B| - |S| - 2 + \big((n - m)|\mathcal{A}_1| - n - h + 2\big). \qquad (4.3)$$

If $n \geq 7h-2$, then

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq |A|+|B|+2(n-3h)-|S|-h-n \geq |A|+|B|-|S|-2.$$

Below assume that $n \leq 7h-3$.

(i) $|S| \geq h+1$.

By (4.2), we have

$$|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq |A|+|B|-|S|-2+\left(\frac{n-3h}{n}\cdot|A|-n-h+2\right).$$

Clearly the function $(x-3h)|A|/x+x$ is increasing on $(0, \sqrt{3h|A|}]$ and is decreasing on $[\sqrt{3h|A|}, +\infty)$. Note that

$$|A| \geq 9|S|^2-5|S|-3 \geq 9h^2+13h+1.$$

It is easy to check that

$$\sqrt{3h|A|} \geq \sqrt{3h(9h^2+13h+1)} \geq \max\{\sqrt{9h^2+13h+1},\ 7h-3\}.$$

If $h \geq 2$, then $\sqrt{9h^2+13h+1} \leq 7h-3$. So

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{n-3h}{n}\cdot|A|-n \geq& (\sqrt{9h^2+13h+1}-3h)\cdot\frac{|A|}{\sqrt{9h^2+13h+1}}-\sqrt{9h^2+13h+1}\\ \geq& (\sqrt{9h^2+13h+1}-3h)\cdot\sqrt{9h^2+13h+1}-\sqrt{9h^2+13h+1}\\ =& h-2+\left(9h^2+12h+3-(3h+1)\sqrt{9h^2+13h+1}\right) \geq h-2,\end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from

$$\frac{9h^2+12h+3}{3h+1} = 3h+3 > \sqrt{9h^2+13h+1}.$$

And if $h=1$, then

$$\frac{n-3h}{n}\cdot|A|-n \geq (7h-6)\cdot\frac{|A|}{7h-3}-(7h-3) \geq 1\cdot\frac{23}{4}-4 > h-2.$$

Thus we get (1.10).

(ii) $|S| = h$.

By (3.5), we may assume that $m+n-1 \leq p(G)$. In view of (3.6), we get

$$\begin{aligned}|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq& |A|+|B|+(n-1)|\mathcal{A}_1|-2h-n-(m-1)\\ \geq& |A|+|B|-|S|-2+\left((n-1)\cdot\left\lceil\frac{|A|}{n}\right\rceil-n-h+3\right).\end{aligned}$$

For $2 \leq n \leq 7h-3$, we have

$$(n-1)\cdot\left\lceil\frac{|A|}{n}\right\rceil-n \geq \min\left\{\left\lceil\frac{|A|}{2}\right\rceil-2,\ (7h-4)\cdot\left\lceil\frac{|A|}{7h-3}\right\rceil-(7h-3)\right\}.$$

Since $|A| \geq 9h^2 - 5h - 3$, it is not difficult to verify that $|A|/2 - 2 \geq h - 3$ for $h \geq 2$, and

$$\frac{(7h-4)|A|}{7h-3} - (7h-3) \geq h - 3$$

for $h \geq 3$. And if $h = 2$, then

$$(7h-4) \cdot \left\lceil \frac{|A|}{7h-3} \right\rceil - (7h-3) \geq 10 \cdot \left\lceil \frac{23}{11} \right\rceil - 11 = 9 \geq h - 3.$$

So we have $|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq |A| + |B| - |S| - 2$.

(II) $|\mathcal{A}_1| = 1$.

If $|\mathcal{A}_1| = |\mathcal{B}_1| = 1$, then our assertion immediately follows from the induction hypothesis on G/H. Suppose that $|\mathcal{A}_1| = 1$ and $|\mathcal{B}_1| \geq 2$. Then

$$m = |A| \geq 9|S|^2 - 5|S| - 3 \geq 6h - 2.$$

Assume that $\bar{a}_{\hat{\mu}_k} - \bar{b}_1 = \bar{s}_{\hat{\lambda}_k} \in \bar{S}$ for $1 \leq k \leq \hat{r}$, and $\bar{a}_{\hat{\gamma}_1} + \bar{b}_{\hat{\eta}_1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{\hat{\gamma}_{n-3h}} + \bar{b}_{\hat{\eta}_{n-3h}}$ are distinct elements of $(\bar{A} \overset{\bar{S}}{+} \bar{B}) \setminus \{\bar{A} + \bar{b}_1\}$ with $\hat{\eta}_j \leq j + 3h$ for $1 \leq j \leq n - 3h$. Let $\mathcal{S}^*_{\hat{\lambda}_k} = (b_1 - a_{\hat{\mu}_k}) + s_{\hat{\lambda}_k} + \mathcal{S}_{\hat{\lambda}_k}$. We obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
|A \overset{S}{+} B| \geq & \sum_{k=1}^{\hat{r}} |\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\mu}_k} \overset{\mathcal{S}^*_{\hat{\lambda}_k}}{+} \mathcal{B}_1| + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq \hat{\nu} \leq m \\ \hat{\nu} \notin \{\hat{\mu}_1, \ldots, \hat{\mu}_{\hat{r}}\}}} |\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\nu}} + \mathcal{B}_1| + \sum_{j=1}^{n-3h} |\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\gamma}_j} + \mathcal{B}_{\hat{\eta}_j}| \\
\geq & \sum_{k=1}^{\hat{r}} (|\mathcal{B}_1| - |\mathcal{S}^*_{\hat{\lambda}_k}|) + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq \hat{\nu} \leq m \\ \hat{\nu} \notin \{\hat{\mu}_1, \ldots, \hat{\mu}_{\hat{r}}\}}} |\mathcal{B}_1| + \sum_{j=1}^{n-3h} |\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\eta}_j}| \\
\geq & 3h|\mathcal{B}_1| + \sum_{j=1}^{n-3h} |\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\eta}_j}| - |S| \geq |B| + (m - 3h)|\mathcal{B}_1| - |S| \\
\geq & |B| + |A| + 2(m - 3h) - |S| - m \geq |A| + |B| - |S| - 2. \qquad (4.4)
\end{aligned}$$

References

[1] N. Alon, *Combinatorial Nullstellensatz*, Combin. Probab. Comput., **8**(1999), 7-29.

[2] N. Alon, M. B. Nathanson and I. Z. Ruzsa, *Adding distinct congruence classes modulo a prime*, Amer. Math. Monthly, **102**(1995), 250-255.

[3] N. Alon, M. B. Nathanson and I. Z. Ruzsa, The polynomial method and restricted sums of congruence classes, J. Number Theory, **56**(1996), 404–417.

[4] P. Balister and J. P. Wheeler, *The Erdős-Heilbronn problem for finite groups*, Acta Arith., **140**(2009), 105-118.

[5] J. A. Dias da Silva and Y. O. Hamidoune, *Cyclic spaces for Grassmann derivatives and additive theory*, Bull. London Math. Soc., **26**(1994), 140-146.

[6] S.-S. Du and H. Pan, *Restricted Sumsets in Finite Nilpotent Groups*, Acta Arith., to appear.

[7] P. Erdős , *On the addition of residue classes* mod p, Proceedings of the 1963 Number Theory Conference at the University of Colorado, University of Colorado Press, (1963), 16-17.
[8] P. Erdős and H. Heilbronn, *On the addition of residue classes* mod p, Acta Arith., **9**(1964), 149-159.
[9] G. Károlyi, *On restricted set addition in abelian groups*, Ann. Univ. Sci. Budapest. Eötvös Sect. Math., **46**(2003), 47-54.
[10] G. Károlyi, *The Erdős-Heilbronn problem in abelian groups*, Israel J. Math., **139**(2004), 349-359.
[11] G. Károlyi, *The Cauchy-Davenport theorem in group extensions*, L'Enseign. Math., **51**(2005), 239-254.
[12] M. B. Nathanson, *Additive number theory. Inverse problems and the geometry of sumsets*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 165, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.
[13] H. Pan and Zhi-Wei Sun, *A lower bound for* $|\{a+b\colon a\in A,\ b\in B,\ P(a,b)\neq 0\}|$, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A, **100**(2002), 387-393.
[14] H. Pan and Zhi-Wei Sun, *Restricted sumsets and a conjecture of Lev*, Israel J. Math., **154**(2006), 21-28.

E-mail address: ssdu@jit.edu.com

E-mail address: haopan79@zoho.com

The Fundamental Division, Jingling Institute of Technology, Nanjing 211169, People's Republic of China

Department of Mathematics, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, People's Republic of China